

Deputy Directors Briefing
The Language Development Program
14 December 1972

I. Introduction: A Brief History

A. DCI signed Working Group Paper on CIA Language Program: Feb 1966

1. Summary of Findings

- a. Same as before, notably 1960 IG Survey.
- b. A widespread lack of essential discipline in management of program.
- c. Lack of discipline stemmed from two notable defects.
 - (1) Obvious lack of specificity which blurred intent of policies and sidestepped detailed guidelines necessary for effective administration.
 - (2) Failure to provide adequately for centralized monitoring and staff supervision of conduct of the program.

2. Example of Lack of Specificity:

"A good example of the obvious lack of specificity:"

25X1A

- a. The Testing Program: [REDACTED] provided that staff personnel who claim any degree of knowledge of a foreign language are required to have their proficiency evaluated through Agency tests. " However, no time limit is set within which such tests must be taken or retaken and no one is charged with responsibility for seeing that it gets done, except the Director of Personnel in the case of new employees entering on duty. Perhaps it should not be too surprising, therefore, that as of 31 December 1964, according to the Office of Personnel, only 34% of the skills recorded in CIA's Foreign Language Inventory had been tested, and at least two-thirds of the proficiency records--self-appraised as well as tested--had been filed prior to 1962.

A vigorous overhaul of the Agency's testing program and Foreign Language Inventory are clearly in order.

We did just this:

b. 1966 In Summary

(1) No real notion of skills

- (a) Some tested
- (b) Some claimed
- (c) Some not recorded at all

(2) No language positions

(3) A Language School attuned to a non-program.

3. Advent of LDC and action to overcome vagueness:

- a. To overcome lack of specificity, re-wrote the Language Regulation--fixing responsibility in each area of concern.
- b. To provide centralized monitoring--the LDC was established with reps from each of your Directorates and with each rep able to speak for you.
- c. In testing:
 - (1) We decided: to base the Agency's program on tested capabilities only.

(2) August 1969: 4,263 claims still pending

ILLEGIB

(3) As of June 1971: probably less than 1000 claims outstanding.

(4) 1972: From [REDACTED]

B. Current Language Capability (as of May 72) 4,082 usable skills ("2" or better) (career agents or contract employees not included)

C. Essential Elements of the LDP

- 1. The identification of positions requiring a language skill.
- 2. A reliable, tested roster of skills.
- 3. An effective monitoring system of language positions and matching skills.
- 4. A determination of needs projected over a reasonable time span. We can tell you precisely what you have tested--only you know what is needed.
- 5. A training-recruitment program to add new skills.

6. THE SINE QUA NON: CONSISTENT TOTAL BACKING OF TOP MANAGEMENT.

Summary:

- a. This is a tough problem.
- b. There can be no relaxation.
- c. Learning languages is costly.

(1) A soft language (French) -- 28 weeks to achieve 2 + to 3 level -----	ca	\$5,000
Salary based on GS-12, middle step -----	ca	9,000
		<u>\$14,000</u>
(2) For a hard language (Russian) -----	ca	\$ 8,200
Plus salary -----	ca	13,800
		<u>\$ 22,000</u>

II. The Role of the Directorates in Setting Goals

A. The LDC has recognized that:

1. Each Directorate has distinct needs.
2. Each Directorate needs latitude to define its own role and write its own rules. Therefore, Agency regulation provides broad guidelines.

B. What Are Proper Goals?

1. Individual language skills: Career lifetime
 - a. Two languages at the 3 level: State's goal.
 - b. Variations of this: A world language at the 3 level and at one time in each career use of a hard language at the 3 level.
 - c. One language at the 3 level before promotion to ? _____.
 - d. No acceptance in a Directorate without a skill or certified aptitude.
 - e. Tying of language skill as element in career progression.
 - f. Establishment of minimum language skill before going overseas.
 - g. "Courtesy" level skill for wife.

2. Identification of Positions requiring a language skill

- a. How many positions in a unit?
- b. This must be a living thing--changing: Now we have this as goal--not hard requirement.
- c. Which positions.
- d. At what level: S-3 for DDP, DDS and S-3 for DDI.
- e. All specific:

See Charts: Exhibit 1 for identification of positions breakdown.
CS and Agency breakdown.

Exhibit 2 - Also CS -- % of positions filled: 1971-72.

- 3. Keeping students in training long enough to achieve meaningful goal: 90% stay for contract -- 2 weeks to 11 months; 90% do not finish prescribed courses of instructions -- 28-44 weeks.
- 4. Long-range projection to assure skill in rarest hard languages: 3 - 4 years of study.
- 5. No untested skills.

III. The Language Control Register:

A. An invaluable management tool.

The LCR is Job #140-H: Lists by:

Directorate

Component

By language unit the required level of language skill for the position plus the capability of the incumbent.

Also, it lists by name, position, and language skill level any other employee in the language unit with a skill in a language required by the unit.

Now published monthly: changing to quarterly.

- B. See Exhibit 3 for Jobs #161-A and Job #040-A.
- C. When the new computer system is in effect--there will be: The number of employees by position and the number of skills in each language unit--this will be "Our STATION BY STATION report."
The other run will be a report on the incentive program--presently we do both of these by hand count.

IV. The Loss of Skills in "hard" languages: This will continue.

- A. Losses: In Albanian, Czech, Greek, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Norwegian, Polish, Slovak and Ukrainian.
Note: Only two of these languages are taught by OTR and probably not taught in many places in the US. Recruitment of speakers of these is negligible--losses will continue unchecked.

SEE ATTACHMENT E OF 21 July 72 Annual Report

B. Replacement of Losses: DDs Must Identify Needs.

- 1. Pin-pointed recruitment.
- 2. Special training.
- 3. Overseas residence for select few.
- 4. CTs: See Exhibit 4.

V. The Incentive Program: (See Exhibit 5)

- A. Number in program: About 200.
- B. LAO leads with 51 enrolled.
- C. Other gains: Arabic, Lao, Persian, Turkish, and Thai.
- D. As of July 72--\$42,600 paid out.

VI. Early Withdrawal: To Point out need -- See Station by Station--Annual Report.

- A. One problem overcome: Withdrawal short of contract.
- B. Now: Withdrawal at end of contract.

C. Contracts:

At the present time about 90% of Language School students stay in language training for the contracted period of time which may vary from two weeks to 11 months depending on the need of the component and the skill at entering of the student.

On the other hand about 90% of our students do not finish prescribed courses of instruction; e. g., the standard French course of 28 weeks or the standard Russian course of 44 weeks.

- C. D. Office of Personnel to incorporate LDP in their annual Personnel Development Program (PDP): Thus assure time for training.

VII. The GAO Findings: Summary

- A. Questions overseas effectiveness--studying outside of FSI schools, etc.
- B. Up-grading--Rickerson's report: Language skill not necessarily improved by service abroad.

VIII. Conclusions

A. We have tools of good LDP.

- 1. Sound regulatory guidance.
- 2. Sound Data Base.
- 3. An excellent Language School.
- 4. A sound incentive program.
- 5. A new emphasis on the need for language skills.

B. What We Need.

- 1. Setting of individual goals: Tying language skill to career progression.
- 2. Setting of language position goals.
- 3. A long-term project of skills needed.
 - a. A training program.
 - b. A recruitment program.

ILLEGIB

